



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,077	10/21/2003	William R. Jones	P24200	6126
7055	7590	12/27/2004	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			TRAN, QUOC DUC	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2643	

DATE MAILED: 12/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/689,077

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

Quoc D Tran

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-16, 18 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 14-19 are recites the limitation "said platform" in claim 14 line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-14 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brouwer et al (6,279,124).

Consider claim 1, Brouwer et al teach an apparatus for communicating with a plurality of disparate systems (col. 3 lines 16-52), comprising: a platform that supports a control interface (col. 2 line 61 – col. 3 line 5) and a different user interface for each of the plurality of disparate systems (col. 3 lines 23-35; col. 5 lines 28-52), said platform enabling the formatting and transfer (i.e. communicating) of data to each of said plurality of disparate systems (col. 3 lines 16-52).

Consider claim 2, Brouwer et al teaches said control interface enabling a user to selectively access each of the different user interfaces (col. 3 lines 2-15).

Art Unit: 2643

Consider claim 6, Brouwer et al teach said platform enabling a user to select one of the different user interfaces and at least one of review and update information associated with a customer authorization request (col. 3 lines 2-15).

Consider claim 7, Brouwer et al teach said different user interfaces each enabling a user to at least one of retrieve and update information associated with one of the plurality of disparate systems (col. 3 lines 6-8).

Consider claim 8, Brouwer et al teach an apparatus for integrating a plurality of maintenance and testing systems that communicate with a plurality of disparate telecommunications systems (col. 3 lines 16-52), comprising: a platform that supports a control interface (col. 2 line 61 – col. 3 line 5) and a different user interface for each of the plurality of disparate telecommunications systems (col. 3 lines 23-35; col. 5 lines 28-52), said platform permitting parallel asynchronous testing of at least two of said disparate telecommunications systems that are connected to the platform (col. 1 lines 25-28; col. 3 lines 53-59).

Consider claim 10, Brouwer et al teach where each of said different user interfaces comprising a graphical user interface (GUI) that facilitates at least one of retrieving data and entering data (col. 3 lines 2-15).

Consider claim 11, Brouwer et al teach where said platform sending and receiving data between said platform and said disparate telecommunications systems (col. 3 lines 16-52).

Consider claim 12, Brouwer et al teach where said control interface enabling a user to access each of the different user interfaces (col. 3 lines 2-15).

Art Unit: 2643

Consider claim 13, Brouwer et al teach where said different user interfaces each enabling a user to at least one of retrieve and update information associated with one of the plurality of disparate telecommunications systems (col. 3 lines 2-15).

Consider claim 14, Brouwer et al teach a computer readable medium for storing a program that integrates a plurality of maintenance and testing systems that communicate with a plurality of disparate telecommunications systems (col. 3 lines 16-52), comprising: a plurality of different user interfaces each communicating with one of the plurality of disparate telecommunications systems, said plurality of different user interfaces interoperating with the plurality of disparate telecommunications systems (col. 3 lines 23-35; col. 5 lines 28-52); and a control interface, [said platform] enabling the formatting and transfer of data from to each of said plurality of disparate systems (col. 3 lines 16-52), said control interface enabling a user to access each of the different user interfaces (col. 3 lines 2-15).

Consider claim 18, Brouwer et al teach where said control interface enabling a user to select one of the different user interfaces and at least one of review and update information associated with a customer authorization request (col. 3 lines 2-15).

Consider claim 19, Brouwer et al teach where said different user interfaces each enabling a user to at least one of retrieve and update information associated with one of the plurality of disparate systems (col. 3 lines 2-15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2643

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brouwer et al (6,279,124) in view of Hammond et al (5,208,846).

Consider claims 3, 9 and 15, Brouwer et al did not suggest where said disparate systems comprising a testing system that performs at least one of remote testing of analog services and testing of ISDN switches. However, Hammond et al suggested such (col. 5 lines 53-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hammond et al into view of Brouwer et al in order to perform testing of both systems.

7. Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brouwer et al (6,279,124) in view of Zey (5,796,953).

Consider claims 4 and 16, Brouwer et al did not suggest where said platform further comprising a user login system that logs a user onto said control interface. However, Zey suggested such (col. 5 lines 1-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Zey into view of Brouwer et al in order to prevent unauthorized access.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 5 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2643

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Facsimile responses should be faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive

Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist)


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Quoc Tran** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5643**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Curtis Kuntz**, can be reached on **(703) 305-4708**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Technology Center 2600** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-0377**.

QUOCTRAN

PRIMARY EXAMINER


AU 2643

December 22, 2004